



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/638,388	08/15/2000	Philip D. Mooney	MOONEY	1998

7590 12/02/2002

Farkas & Manelli PLLC
2000 M Street N W 7th Floor
Washington, DC 20036-3307

EXAMINER

KUMAR, SRILAKSHMI K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2675

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2002

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

M

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/638,388

Applicant(s)

MOONEY ET AL. 

Examiner

Srilakshmi K. Kumar

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Will (US 5,970,388) in view of de la Huerga (US 5,960,085).

As to independent claim 1, Will discloses an electronic wireless badge device (Fig. 3a) comprising, a wireless front end and an electronic display adapted to electronically display badge information received by said wireless front end (col. 4, lines 17-48).

Will does not disclose where the displayed information is that of a wearer of said electronic wireless badge device. De la Huerga discloses a security badge for automated access control and secure data gathering, where in Fig. 1 discloses the security badge (item 10) with a display (item 16). In col. 9, lines 25-50, de la Huerga discloses user identity information on the graphic display, wherein the graphic display (item 16) of the security badge may be any of a variety of forms, including a liquid crystal display panel and an active matrix display panel. In Fig. 6 and in col. 6, lines 35-44, de la Huerga discloses the processor circuitry of the security badge including a display (item 258) such as a light emitting diode array, an LCD screen or a passive or active matrix screen. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the wearer identity information of the de la Huerga system with that of Will, as they

Art Unit: 2675

both disclose a wireless security badge with a display. The identity information of the wearer displayed on the wireless badge is advantageous it is used to disclose authorization for access of the wearer.

As to independent claim 8, limitation of claim 1, and further comprising, a network security station, comprising, a database of badge information corresponding to said authorized user codes (col. 5, lines 1-6); and a wireless front end adapted to transmit badge information retrieved from said database of badge information (col. 4, lines 17-64).

As to independent claims 12 and 20, limitations of claims 1 and 8, and further comprising, a method and an apparatus of providing electronic badge information for display on a user's electronic wireless badge comprising, establishing a wireless network between a network security station and a plurality of electronic wireless badges (Fig. 1, col. 2, line 63-col. 3, line 5, col. 4, lines 17-18); transmitting badge display information to each of said plurality of electronic wireless badges (col. 4, lines 17-64); and electronically displaying said badge display information on each of said plurality of electronic wireless badges (col. 4, lines 17-64).

As to dependent claim 2 and 9, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising where said electronic display is adapted to display any of one of a plurality of different badge information at any one time (col. 4, lines 17-64, electronic mail message, incoming telephone call).

As to dependent claims 3, 9, 13 and 21, Will discloses a central station with several remote stations with several communications units or wireless badges (Fig. 1). A piconet is a connection between a master and one or more slaves. Thus it would be inherent that the system disclosed by Will is that of a piconet.

Art Unit: 2675

As to dependent claims 5 and 11, limitations of claims 1 and 8, and further comprising wherein said badge information includes a photo of an authorized wearer (Fig. 3a, col. 4, lines 41-44).

As to dependent claim 6, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising wherein said electronic display is an LCD device (Fig. 3a, item 17, col. 4, lines 44-48).

As to dependent claims 14 and 22 limitations of claims 13 and 21, and further comprising wherein said badge display information displayed on each of said plurality of electronic wireless badges is different (col. 4, lines 17-64).

As to dependent claims 15 and 23, limitations of claims 13 and 21, and further comprising, authorizing said electronic wireless badges to receive badge display information.

As to dependent claim 16 and 24, limitations of claims 13 and 21, and further comprising, altering said badge display information periodically to prevent fraud (col. 4, lines 3-8).

As to dependent claims 17 and 25, limitations of claims 16 and 24, and further comprising, flashing a display of said wireless badges in concert (col. 4, lines 17-26)

As to dependent claims 18 and 26, limitations of claims 13 and 21, and further comprising, linking badge information stored in said electronic wireless badge (communications unit) with an application computer (remote and central stations) (Fig. 1).

As to dependent claims 19 and 27, limitations of claims 18 and 26, and further comprising wherein said application computer is a register checkout (Fig. 1, remote stations).

3. Claims 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Will as applied to claims 1 and 8, above, and further in view of Bork et al. (US 6,246,376).

Art Unit: 2675

As to dependent claims 4 and 10 limitations of claim 1 and 8, and further comprising wherein said wireless piconet front end is a BLUETOOTH device. Will does not disclose a BLUETOOTH device. Bork et al disclose in col. 2, lines 4-11 where a wireless location and direction indicator users BLUETOOTH protocol, which permits multiple piconets to exist in, close proximity. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the system of Bork et al could have been incorporated into that of Will. Will discloses a wireless system with a wireless badge using communications means for locating and subsequently sending other information to the wireless badges. Bork et al disclose a system for wireless locating for multiple devices. The piconets using BLUETOOTH is advantageous as it is capable of communicating with like communication devices to transfer identification data and either fixed or variable location data as disclosed by Bork et al.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Srilakshmi K. Kumar** whose telephone number is (703) 306 5575.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Saras, can be reached at (703) 305-9720.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Art Unit: 2675

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Srilakshmi K. Kumar
Examiner
Art Unit 2675

SKK
November 29, 2002

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Steven Saras', written in a cursive style.

STEVEN SARAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600